



Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner presented a restriction requirement for group I, claims 1-5, and group II claims 6-10 and indicated that there appeared to be no prior art preventing allowance of group II claims. Practitioner elected group II without traverse. After first conversation, examiner left a voice message regarding a multiple dependency issue with claims 9 and 10 and a potential solution. Practitioner Baxley responded by voice message on 6-20-08 agreeing that by Examiner's Amendment claim 9 line one be modified to delete "or 8" and claim 10 line one be modified to delete "or 8 or 9"..

/RR/